



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,669	08/08/2001	Kelly L. Dempki	10022/142	3664

28164 7590 06/01/2006
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,669

Applicant(s)

DEMPSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Sumaiya A. Chowdhury

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/01, 5/2/02, 9/12/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama (CA 2387386) in view of Reynolds (7020888)

Considering claims 1, Akiyama discloses a method for enhancing a television broadcast program comprising:

- (a) receiving the television broadcast program (TV program) – p. 20, lines 5-10;
- (b) receiving replacement advertising data (replacement information 60, 61 – Fig. 6) from a first memory storage (11 – Fig. 6, p. 21, lines 20-24), the advertising data representing an instruction set for rendering into a video replacement advertising segment (60, 61 – Fig. 6) by a client processor (52, 54 – Fig. 6); (p. 21, lines 14-20);
- (c) rendering on the client processor (52, 54 – Fig. 6) the replacement advertising segment – p. 19, lines 17-27, p. 21, lines 16-20;
- (d) blocking the display of a television broadcast advertisement (commercial) –

Art Unit: 2623

p. 19, lines 9-11, p. 20, lines 12-13;

(e) displaying the replacement advertising segment instead of the television broadcast advertisement on a television display – p. 19, lines 9-11, p. 20, lines 12-13, p. 28, lines 1-3; and

(f) displaying the television broadcast program after completion of the replacement advertising segment – (S37 & S38 – Fig. 13, p. 27, lines 6-10).

However, Akiyama fails to teach animated video content and data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering an animated video.

In an analogous art, Reynolds teaches animated video content (col. 12, lines 8-11, also see col. 5, Example Two, - “**Executable code** that instructs consumer device to show an **animated view** of the current hole in play on 102.2A”). Reynolds additionally teaches data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering animated video - (col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 2, col. 4, lines 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama's invention to include animated video content and data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering an animated video, as taught by Reynolds, for the advantage of providing content on the television which allows the user to interact with.

Considering claim 2, Akiyama and Reynolds disclose a method comprising selecting the replacement advertising segment based on a viewer profile – (In particular,

Art Unit: 2623

Akiyama discloses that the replacement advertising segment is selected by referring to the user profile. - S33 – Fig. 13, paragraph p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22).

Considering claim 4 Akiyama and Reynolds disclose the method further comprising creating the viewer profile (individual profile 62 – Fig. 6) based on a set of preferences selected by the viewer (In particular, Akiyama discloses that the hard disk memory (11) includes an individual profile (62) inputted beforehand by the viewer - p. 21, lines 3-4).

Considering claim 11, Akiyama discloses a method for enhancing a television broadcast program comprising:

- (a) receiving programming data representing synchronization data for a plurality of sequential program segments in a television broadcast programs (Fig. 8, p. 22, lines 7-19);
- (b) receiving information related to a plurality of replacement program segments (replacement information 60, 61 – Fig. 6, p. 21, lines 14-20);
- (c) selecting a desired replacement segment (p. 19, lines 9-11, p. 20. lines 12-13, p. 28, lines 1-3);
- (d) synchronizing the replacement segment with one of said plurality of television broadcast segments (Fig. 8, p. 22, lines 7-19);
- (e) receiving the selected replacement segments (60, 61 – Fig. 6, p. 21, lines 14-20);

(f) blocking the display of the television broadcast segment (p. 19, lines 9-11, p. 20, lines 12-13); and

(g) displaying the selected replacement segment on a television display in place of the synchronized television broadcast segment (p. 19, lines 9-11, p. 20, lines 12-13, p. 28, lines 1-3).

However, Akiyama fails to teach executable instructions sets for generating data, and rendering on a local processor the data by executing the executable instruction sets.

In an analogous art, Reynolds additionally teaches data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering animated video is processed by a local processor (210, 212, 214 – Fig. 2) [col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 2, col. 4, lines 23-26, col. 12, lines 8-11, also see col. 5, Example Two, - “**Executable code** that instructs consumer device to show an **animated view** of the current hole in play on 102.2A”]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama's invention to include animated video content and data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering an animated video, as taught by Reynolds, for the advantage of providing content on the television which allows the user to interact with.

Considering claim 12, Akiyama and Reynolds teaches the claimed limitations. In particular, Akiyama discloses a method comprising selecting the replacement

Art Unit: 2623

advertising segment based on a viewer profile (S33 – Fig. 13, paragraph p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22).

Considering claim 14, Akiyama and Reynolds teaches the claimed limitations. In particular, Akiyama discloses the method further comprising developing the viewer profile (individual profile 62 – Fig. 6) based on a set of preferences selected by the viewer (Akiyama discloses that the hard disk memory (11) includes an individual profile (62) inputted beforehand by the viewer - p. 21, lines 3-4).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Reynolds as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Herz (6,088,722).

Considering claim 3, Akiyama discloses that a viewer profile is established for selecting replacement advertisements – p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22.

However, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method comprising developing a viewer profile based on past interaction with the replacement advertising segment.

In an analogous art, Herz discloses a method in which a passive feedback technique is provided whereby the programming viewed by the customers are automatically monitored and used to adjust the customer profiles – col. 14, lines 17-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's system to include developing a

viewer profile based on past interaction, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automatically updating viewer profiles based on content which is viewed rather than a user manually selecting desired content.

5. Claims 5-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama in view of Reynolds as applied to claim 2/5 above, and further in view of Haas (US 2002/0063714).

Considering claim 5, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose displaying an on-screen query of optional modifications to the replacement advertising segment, and rendering the modifications to the replacement advertising segment in response to the modifications selected by the viewer.

In an analogous art, Haas discloses that a menu is displayed for a user to modify the animated object displayed such that a user could interact with the object displayed on-screen of a television. – paragraph [0112].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's system to include displaying an on-screen query of optional modifications to the replacement advertising segment, and rendering the modifications to the replacement advertising segment in response to the modifications selected by the viewer, as taught by Haas, for the advantage of allowing the user to interact with the object displayed on-screen of a television.

Considering claim 6, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method comprising storing the selected modifications and for subsequent receipt of the same replacement advertising segment, rendering the segment with the previously selected modifications.

In an analogous art, Haas discloses a method in which the displayed object could be modified and then saved for later retrieval – paragraph [0105].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's system to include a method comprising storing the selected modifications and for subsequent receipt of the same replacement advertising segment, rendering the segment with the previously selected modifications, as taught by Haas, for the advantage of providing the user to retrieve the saved modifications later on.

Considering claim 7, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method wherein said modifications comprise color, component in displayed objects, viewing perspective, zoom, play-back speed, background audio sound track, and special effects.

In an analogous art, Haas discloses a method wherein said modifications comprise color (control buttons 43a-43e – Fig. 3, paragraph [0112]), component in displayed objects (Fig. 28a-28d, paragraph [0133]), viewing perspective, zoom (zoom in control button 41 & zoom out control button 42 – Fig. 3, paragraph [0112]), play-back speed (slider bar 58 – Fig. 3, paragraph [0112]), background audio sound track (paragraph [0103] & [0110]), and special effects (creating a 360 degree panoramic image 212 of the interior – Fig. 28a-28d, paragraph [0133]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's method to include modifications comprising color, component in displayed objects, viewing perspective, zoom, play-back speed, background audio sound track, and special effects, as taught by Haas, for the advantage of allowing the user to modify a displayed object to create an object desirable to the user and to allow interaction with the object on-screen.

Claim 8 contains the same limitations as claim 7 and is analyzed as previously discussed with that claim.

Considering claim 10, Akiyama and Reynolds disclose selection based on viewer profile (In particular, Akiyama discloses that a replacement advertisement segment is selected from among the plurality of replacement advertisement segments by referring to the individual profile. - p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22). However, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method comprising of providing a plurality of audio accompaniments to the advertising segment, and selecting the audio accompaniment based on the viewer profile.

In an analogous art, Haas discloses that an audio track is selected from a plurality of audio tracks by the user to be played along with a displayed object - paragraph [0103] & [0110].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's system to include a user to

Art Unit: 2623

select to play an audio track from a plurality of audio tracks, as taught by Haas, for the advantage of complimenting the displayed object.

6. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama (CA 2387386) and Reynolds in view of Herz (6,088,722).

Considering claim 13, Akiyama and Reynolds disclose that a viewer profile is established for selecting replacement advertisements – (See Akiyama, p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22. However, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method comprising developing the viewer profile based on past selections of replacement segments).

In an analogous art, Herz discloses a method in which a passive feedback technique is provided whereby the programming viewed by the customers are automatically monitored and used to adjust the customer profiles – col. 14, lines 17-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds' system to include developing a viewer profile based on past interaction, as taught by Herz, for the advantage of automatically updating viewer profiles based on content which is viewed rather than a user manually selecting desired content.

7. Claims 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama (CA 2387386) and Reynolds in view of Beach (6,728,713).

Considering claim 15, Akiyama and Reynolds fail to disclose a method comprising of augmenting the viewer preferences based on viewer's past selection of skipping through selected segments.

In an analogous art, Beach discloses that preference profiles are automatically adjusted based on the viewer's decision to skip a particular segment such that programming could be automatically selected based on the user's preferences – col. 17, lines 15-25.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds' system to include adjusting the viewer profile based on content that a viewer skips through, as taught by Beach, for the advantage of providing the user with programming which could be automatically selected based on the user's preferences.

8. Claims 21, 25, 27, and 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz in view of Reynolds and further in view of Schoff (6240555).

Considering claim 21, Mankovitz discloses a method for enhancing a television broadcast program comprising:

- (a) receiving the television broadcast program – p. 5, lines 1-10 & lines 22-25;

(b) receiving supplemental informational data (web site address to which selected web site name is linked) from a first memory storage (36– Fig. 1, p. 6, lines 20-24);

(c) rendering on a client processor (microprocessor 24 – Fig. 1) supplemental video content images (p. 6, lines 25-30); and

(d) displaying the television program with supplemental video images displayed along with television program on a television display (p. 6, lines 10-30).

However, Mankovitz fails to teach data comprising an executable instruction set and processing animated video from the executable instruction set.

In an analogous art, Reynolds additionally teaches data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering animated video is processed by a local processor (210, 212, 214 – Fig. 2) [col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 2, col. 4, lines 23-26, col. 12, lines 8-11, also see col. 5, Example Two, - “**Executable code** that instructs consumer device to show an **animated view** of the current hole in play on 102.2A”]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to modify Mankovitz’s invention to include animated video content and data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering an animated video, as taught by Reynolds, for the advantage of providing content on the television which allows the user to interact with.

However, Mankovitz and Reynolds fail to teach wherein supplemental content overlays portions of the television program.

In an analogous art, Schoff teaches wherein supplemental content partly overlays the television program in order to provide supplemental information along with the television program – col. 10, lines 47-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz and Reynolds's invention to include supplemental content partly overlays the television program, as taught by Schoff, for the advantage of providing supplemental information along with the television program.

Considering claim 25, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses a method comprising synchronizing the starting time and ending time for display of the supplemental video content with a portion the television program wherein the supplemental video content is informationally related to the synchronized portion of the television program – p. 6, lines 25-30.

Considering claim 27, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses a method comprising of selecting the supplemental data (web page) in response to a command received from a viewer (p. 6, lines 14-25).

Considering claim 28, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses a method wherein the receiving

Art Unit: 2623

supplemental data (web page) comprises a viewer selecting information of interest, and in response to the selection identifying a location for the memory storage (33 – Fig. 1) storing the supplemental data, and sending a request for the information to be transmitted to the client processor (24 – Fig. 1); (p. 6, lines 20-30);

9. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Hidary (5,774,664).

Considering claim 24, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fails to disclose a method comprising the steps of decoding resource data transmitted with said television program, examining said data to determine a URL encoded on said data, and retrieving the supplemental data from the first memory storage associated with the URL.

In an analogous art, Hidary discloses that video programming (television program) which is sent to a user is encoded with URLs in the vertical blank interval. When the receiver receives the programming, the URL decoder (12 – Fig. 1) extracts the URLs to retrieve the particular web pages (supplemental data) from the internet (memory storage) – col. 4, lines 40-56, col. 5, lines 25-31.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include decoding resource data transmitted with said television program, examining said data to determine a URL encoded on said data, and retrieving the supplemental data from the

Art Unit: 2623

first memory storage associated with the URL, as taught by Hidary, for the advantage of providing the user the ease of automatically retrieving related web content to the television broadcast program.

10. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Akiyama.

Considering claim 26, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose a method comprising selecting the supplemental data based on a viewer profile.

In an analogous art, Akiyama discloses that the supplemental data is selected by referring to the user profile. - S33 – Fig. 13, paragraph p. 21, lines 11-13 & p. 26, lines 18-22

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include selecting the supplemental data based on a viewer profile, as taught by Akiyama, for the advantage of providing the user content based on his/her own preferences.

11. Claims 29 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Deo (6,832,084).

Art Unit: 2623

Considering claim 29, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose a method wherein the supplemental data comprises a software applet and financial data for rendering a graphical display of the financial information.

In an analogous art, Deo discloses a system in which an applet is implemented to provide a graphical display of updated stock information to the user – col. 17, lines 30-32 & lines 40-67.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include an applet to provide a user with updated stock information, as taught by Deo, for the advantage of providing the user the convenience to view a graphical display of financial information by merely downloading an applet.

Considering claim 35, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose altering the graphical display in response to an input from a manual input device under control of a viewer.

In an analogous art, Deo discloses that the user alters the graphical display through the input device (wireless receiver 52 – Fig. 2) to view the information in a format in which a user pleases to view – col. 17, lines 18-33.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include altering the graphical display in response to an input from a manual input device under

Art Unit: 2623

control of a viewer, as taught by Deo, for the advantage of providing the user to view a display in a format in which a user pleases to.

12. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff in view of Deo as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Zellner (6,738,808).

Considering claim 32, Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff and Deo fail to disclose that the financial information comprises information associated with a viewer.

In an analogous art, Zellner teaches that a viewer could view his/her own stock quotes such that users could have customer-specific information – col. 10, lines 14-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo's system to include financial information associated with the viewer, as taught by Zellner, for the advantage of providing customer-specific information.

13. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, and Zellner as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Kwok (6,829,711).

Considering claim 33, Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, and Zellner fail to disclose a method wherein the financial data is obtained from an internet server from a content provider selected by the viewer.

In an analogous art, Kwok discloses a method wherein the financial data (bank account information) is obtained from an internet server (web server) from a content provider (financial institution) selected by the user (The user can access the web site of the financial institution to access his/her own bank account. The web server at that web site would authenticate the user – col. 4, lines 55-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, and Zellner's invention to include a method wherein the financial data is obtained from an internet server from a content provider selected by the viewer for the advantage of providing the user to directly access to her/her own financial information.

14. Claim 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, Zellner, and Kwok as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Ward (US 2003/0093353).

Information relied upon in Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0028] & [0029] correspond to information in application number 09/610,160 filed on Jul. 5, 2000

Considering claim 34, Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, Zellner, and Kwok fail to disclose a method wherein the content provider is a financial services company with whom the viewer has an investment account.

In an analogous art, Ward discloses that the investment services hosting site (104 – Fig. 1) has a web server (110 – Fig. 1) and an investor portfolio database (114 – Fig. 1). The web server handles multiple requests from investor devices and serves web pages containing investment information to the requesting investors – paragraph [0028] & [0029].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, Deo, and Zellner's system to include a method wherein the content provider is a financial services company with whom the viewer has an investment account, as taught by Ward, for the advantage of allowing the user to directly access his/her own investment account from the financial services company's website.

15. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff in view of Kwok (6,829,711).

Considering claim 36, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose a method wherein the memory storage contains financial data associated with the viewer.

In an analogous art, Kwok discloses a method wherein the memory storage (web server) contains financial data (bank account information) associated with the viewer

Art Unit: 2623

such that the viewer could access the financial institution's web site to view his/her bank account info directly from any convenient location (col. 4, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include a memory storage which contains financial data associated with the viewer, as taught by Kwok, for the advantage of allowing the user to access his/her personal financial institution's web site to view his/her bank account info directly from any convenient location.

16. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Srinivasan (6,357,042).

Considering claim 22, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose a method wherein the first memory storage resides in an internet server.

In an analogous art, Srinivasan discloses that advertisements are stored remotely at a web server as video segments use up a huge amount of memory –col. 30, lines 56-59.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include a system wherein the first memory storage resides in an internet server, as taught by Srinivasan, for the advantage of storing a huge amount of data at an internet server as servers have huge amounts of memory.

17. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Griggs (US 2002/0029384).

Considering claim 23, Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff fail to disclose a method wherein the first memory storage resides in a personal computer proximate to the television display.

In an analogous art, Griggs discloses a personal computer (504 – Fig. 5) proximate to a television display (502 – Fig. 5) such that the computer can provide a logical interface between the television set and content data transmitted over the system network – paragraph [0038].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, and Schoff's system to include a personal computer proximate to a television display, as taught by Griggs, for the advantage of providing a logical interface between the television set and content data transmitted over the system network.

18. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo, as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Ebert (6539423).

As for claim 30, Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo fail to teach an animated ticker tape of financial quotes.

In an analogous art, Ebert teaches an animated ticker tape of financial quotes in order to display a more pleasing ticker – col. 9, lines 30-32.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo's invention to include an animated ticker tape of financial quotes, as taught by Ebert, for the advantage of displaying a more pleasing ticker.

19. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Dias (6,122,011).

Considering claim 31, Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo fail to teach that financial information comprises information associated with the content of the displayed television program.

In an analogous art, Dias teaches that a user watches a Nightly Business News television broadcast program. Nightly Business News discusses financial information and is a television program – col. 4, lines 36-39.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz, Reynolds, Schoff, and Deo's system to include financial information comprising information associated with the content of the

Art Unit: 2623

displayed television program, as taught by Dias, for the advantage of providing financial information which may be of particular interest to the user.

20. Claims 37, and 40-42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz in view of Reynolds.

Considering claim 37, Mankovitz discloses a system for displaying enhanced television broadcast programs comprising:

a multimedia controller (receiver in Fig. 1) having a television broadcast signal tuner receiver (tuner 11 – Fig. 1), a communication port (transmission link 34 – Fig. 1) in communication with external sources (Internal Source Provider 33 – Fig. 1; p.6, lines 25-29) of supplemental content data (website data, p. 5, lines 25-28), a first memory storage (storage device 52 – Fig. 1) for storing the television broadcast signals (p. 5, lines 1-14), a second memory storage (website data memory 36 – Fig. 1) for storing the supplemental content data (p. 6, lines 19-30), and a processor (microprocessor 24 – Fig. 1) capable of rendering photo-realistic video images from the supplemental content data (p. 6, lines 25-31);

a video display monitor (TV 20 – Fig. 1) in communication with the multimedia controller; and

a manual input device (Viewer Input Device 28– Fig. 1) in communication with the multimedia controller.

However, Mankovitz fails to teach content comprising executable instruction sets and animated video content.

In an analogous art, Reynolds additionally teaches data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering animated video is processed by a local processor (210, 212, 214 – Fig. 2) [col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 2, col. 4, lines 23-26, col. 12, lines 8-11, also see col. 5, Example Two, - “**Executable code** that instructs consumer device to show an **animated view** of the current hole in play on 102.2A”]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz's invention to include animated video content and data comprising an executable instruction set for rendering an animated video, as taught by Reynolds, for the advantage of providing content on the television which allows the user to interact with.

Considering claim 40, Mankovitz and Reynolds disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses the system comprising a fourth memory storage (52 – Fig. 1) for storing television broadcast programs in digitized format for later recall and display – p. 9, lines 8-22.

Considering claim 41, Mankovitz and Reynolds disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses the system wherein the multimedia controller further comprises means to generate selectively a signal for display on the video display monitor wherein the signal comprises the television broadcast signal (p. 5, lines 31-37).

Considering claim 42, Mankovitz and Reynolds disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Mankovitz discloses the system wherein the manual input device is a remote control – p. 5, lines 33-35

21. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz and Reynolds as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Pendakur (US 2003/0016673).

Considering claim 38, Mankovitz and Reynolds fail to disclose the system comprising a personal computer in communication with the multimedia controller.

In an analogous art, Pendakur discloses a personal computer coupled with a receiver (multimedia controller) to assist in receiving content and providing feedback – paragraph [0030].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz and Reynolds' system to include a personal computer in communication with the multimedia controller, as taught by Pendakur, for the advantage of allowing the system to receive content and provide feedback.

22. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz and Reynolds as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Akiyama.

Considering claim 39, Mankovitz and Reynolds fail to disclose the system further comprising a third memory storage for storing viewer profiles.

In an analogous art, Akiyama discloses the system further comprising a third memory storage (hard disk memory 11 – Fig. 6) for storing viewer profiles such that only content of interest to the user will be displayed - p.21, lines 3-4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz and Reynolds' invention to include comprising a third memory storage for storing viewer profiles, as taught by Akiyama, for the advantage of displaying content only of interest to the user.

23. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz and Reynolds as applied to claim 42 above, and further in view of Huang (6,437,836).

Considering claim 43, Mankovitz and Reynolds fail to disclose the system wherein the remote control comprises a personal digital assistant having an infrared transceiver for communication with the multimedia controller, said personal digital assistant having a configurable display on a touch sensitive screen, said configurable display being configured to correspond to the active selections available to a user for a given images on the video display monitor.

In an analogous art, Huang discloses a system wherein the remote control (Fig. 1A) comprises a personal digital assistant (Palm Pilot – Fig. 1, Palm Pilot 204 – Fig. 2)

Art Unit: 2623

having an infrared transceiver (117 – IR Transmitter, col. 6, lines 10-15) for communication with the multimedia controller (microcontroller 202 – Fig. 2), said personal digital assistant having a configurable display on a touch sensitive screen (touch screen 218 – Fig. 2) said configurable display being configured to correspond to the active selections available to a user for a given images on the video display monitor (col. 5, lines 1-10, col. 6, lines 44-47, col. 7, lines 52- 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Mankovitz and Reynolds' system to include a remote control comprising a personal digital assistant having an infrared transceiver for communication with the multimedia controller, said personal digital assistant having a configurable display on a touch sensitive screen, said configurable display being configured to correspond to the active selections available to a user for a given images on the video display monitor, as taught by Huang, for the advantage of avoiding the constraints associated with determining which particular buttons should be included in the design of a remote control, and which buttons should be left out.

24. Claims 9, 16, ^{and 20} ~~and~~ 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama and Reynolds as applied to claim 1/16 above, and further in view of Daniels (6973669).

As for claims 9 and 16, Akiyama teaches displaying replacement advertising content. However, Akiyama and Reynolds fails to teach:

Art Unit: 2623

determining whether television broadcast program has resumed after end of the television break, determining whether the television break has ended, and if the television break has not ended, storing the resumed television broadcast program on a storage device from a beginning point, and displaying the resumed broadcast program from the beginning point.

In an analogous art, Daniels teaches:

determining whether television broadcast program has resumed after end of the television break, determining whether the television break has ended, and if television break has not ended, storing the resumed television broadcast program on a storage device from a beginning point, and displaying the resumed broadcast program from the beginning point – col. 19, lines 26-55, col. 20, lines 6-40, col. 21, lines 11-23.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama and Reynolds's invention to include determining whether television broadcast program has resumed after end of the television break, determining whether the television break has ended, and if television break has not ended, storing the resumed television broadcast program on a storage device from a beginning point, and displaying the resumed broadcast program from the beginning point, as taught by Daniels, for the advantage of allowing the user to not miss any portion of the television broadcast.

Considering claim 19, Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Akiyama discloses a method wherein the programming data

Art Unit: 2623

(synchronizing data) is received from data encoded with television broadcast program (The TV programs are received though digital waves which are sent to the decoder (56) in the TV receiver – p.20, lines 5-10. The synchronizing data is also received through digital waves by the TV receiver – p.22, lines 7-9. Therefore, the programming data is encoded with the TV broadcast program).

Considering claim 20, Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels disclose the claimed limitations. In particular, Akiyama discloses a method wherein the data representing the selected replacement segments comprise geometry and texture data for use with the executable instructions sets for rendering an animated video segment by a client processor (p. 15, lines 7-12, p. 18, lines 23-26, p. 19, lines 17-18, p. 20, lines 5-8, p. 22, lines 7-8, p. 28, lines 7-9).

25. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Haas (US 2002/0063714).

Considering claim 17, Reynolds teaches executable instruction sets and executable programming code. However, Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels fail to disclose a method wherein the executable instruction sets for generating an advertising segment comprise executable programming code for rendering into an animated video segment by a client processor.

Art Unit: 2623

In an analogous art, Haas discloses a method wherein the data representing an advertising segment is in an instruction set for rendering into an animated video segment by a client processor such that the user could alter or change the images displayed – paragraph [0106].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels' method to include data representing an advertising segment is in an instruction set for rendering into an animated video segment by a client processor, as taught by Haas, for the advantage of allowing the user to alter or change the images displayed.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels' as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Plotnick (US 2005/0097599).

Considering claim 18, Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels fail to disclose displaying an on-screen query of optional replacement segments, and selecting the desired replacement segments in response to the command received by the viewer.

In an analogous art, Plotnick discloses that ads are stored on a recording medium and retrieved when the user requests the ad through a direct selection on a menu - paragraph [0127].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Akiyama, Reynolds, and Daniels' system to include

Art Unit: 2623

displaying an on-screen query of optional replacement segments, and selecting the desired replacement segments in response to the command received by the viewer, as taught by Plotnick, for the advantage of allowing the user to choose a desired replacement segment.

Conclusion


26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sumaiya A. Chowdhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SAC


CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600